

United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1459 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uapto.gov

٢	APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
٦	09/832,877	04/12/2001	Roland De La Mettrie	5725.0407-01	2716	-
	22852	22852 7590 10/27/2003 FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER			EXAMINER	
	FINNEGAN				ELHILO, EISA B	
	LLP 1300 I STREI	FT NW		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	1/3
		ON, DC 20005		1751		• /

DATE MAILED: 10/27/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

· •		Application No.	Applicant(s)
	•	09/832,877	METTRIE ET AL.
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	•	Eisa B Elhilo	1751
	The MAILING DATE of this communication ap	1	
Period fo			
THE I - External form - If the - If NO - Failuring - Any rearms	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. nsions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. 'SSU' (MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a repoperiod for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period re to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statut reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailined patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	136(a). In no event, however ly within the statutory minim will apply and will expire SIX a, cause the application to be	r, may a reply be timely filed Im of thirty (30) days will be considered timely. (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. come ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status	D	A	
1)[Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19		1
2a) ☐	·	nis action is non-fina	
3)	Since this application is in condition for allow closed in accordance with the practice under		
•	ion of Claims		
	Claim(s) 26-47 is/are pending in the application		
	4a) Of the above claim(s) 44-47 is/are withdra	wn from consideration	on.
5)□	Claim(s) is/are allowed.		
6)⊠	Claim(s) <u>26-43</u> is/are rejected.		
	Claim(s) is/are objected to.		
	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	or election requireme	ent.
· · ·	ion Papers		
	The specification is objected to by the Examine The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acce		to by the Examiner
10)	Applicant may not request that any objection to the		
11)	The proposed drawing correction filed on		
,	If approved, corrected drawings are required in re		
12)	The oath or declaration is objected to by the E		
7—	under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120		
_	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreig	n priority under 35 l	J.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
	1. Certified copies of the priority documen	ts have been receiv	ed.
	2. Certified copies of the priority documen		
* 0	Copies of the certified copies of the pricapplication from the International Buse the attached detailed Office action for a list	ority documents have ureau (PCT Rule 17	e been received in this National Stage 2(a)).
	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domest		
а	The translation of the foreign language pr Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domes	ovisional application	has been received.
Attachmen			
2) Notic	ce of References Cited (PTO-892) ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 4	5) 🔲 N	sterview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) otice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) ther:
S. Patent and T	Frademark Office		Part of Paner No. 13

Application/Control Number: 09/832,877

Art Unit: 1751

,,

DETAILED ACTION

- This action is responsive to the applicant's election received by the office on August 19, 2003.
- Applicant's election with traverse to prosecute the invention of Group I. Election of claims 26-43 is acknowledged. Claims 44-47 are withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected invention. Therefore, claims 26-43 are pending in this application.
- The traversal is on the ground(s) that the examiner has applied the incorrect standard for this restriction requirement and the restriction requirement should follow the U.S. standard pursuant to 35 U.S.C. 121, and also if the search and examination of an entire application can be made without serious burden, the Office must examine it on the merits, even though it includes claims to distinct or independent inventions. This is not found persuasive because the instant application is a divisional and claims priority to an earlier national stage application (09/319,167) under 35 U.S.C 371, PCT. Therefore, PCT Rules are to be applied. Further, even under U.S.C. 121, the inventions of groups I, II and III are patentably independent and distinct and they are classified and searched in different classes and subclasses and the search required for each group is not required for the other groups of inventions. Therefore, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper. The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.
- 4 Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the

Application/Control Number: 09/832,877

Art Unit: 1751

ĵ١

application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 26-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tomura et al. (US 6,027,719) in view of Patel et al. (US 5,348,736).

Tomura (US' 719) teaches an aqueous cosmetic composition comprising uricase enzyme as 2-electron oxidoreductase, uric acid as a donor and 1.5 % of para-phenylenediamine as an oxidation base, 0.08 % of m-aminophenol as a coupler, hydrochloride as acid addition salt as claimed in claims 26-33 (see col. 6, Example 1), direct dyes as claimed in claim 34 (see col. 3, line 46), 1% of polyoxyethylene alkyl ether as an organic solvent as claimed in claims 35-36 (see col. 6, Example 2). The composition has a pH of 7, which within the claimed ranges as claimed in claims 38-39 (see col. 2, line 17) and surfactants as claimed in claim 40 (see col. 3, lines 42-43). Tomura also teaches a method for dyeing hair, wherein the dyeing ingredients are mixed together and then applied to the hair as claimed in claims 41-43 (see col. 6, lines 40-49).

The instant claims differ from the reference by reciting a composition comprising at least one aminosilicone component as claimed. Further, the reference does not teach organic solvent in the claimed amount as claimed in claim 37.

Application/Control Number: 09/832,877

Art Unit: 1751

However, the reference teaches a hair dyeing composition comprising conditioners such as silicone oils (see col. 3, line 45).

Patel (US' 736) teaches in analogous art a hair dyeing composition comprising conditioning agents such as amino silicone components as claimed (see col. 5, lines 20-30) and organic solvents in the amount of 1 to 10%, which is overlapped with the claimed ranges as claimed in, claim 37 (see col. 9, lines 20-22).

Therefore, in view of the teaching of the secondary reference, one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would be motivated to modify the composition of the primary reference by incorporating aminosilicone component as taught by Patel to make such a composition with a reasonable expectation of success because Tomura as a primary reference teaches clearly a composition that comprises silicone oils as conditioning agents wherein the composition further comprises organic solvents and Patel teaches a shampoo dyeing composition comprising aminosilicone as a conditioning agent and, thus, a person of the ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to use aminosilicone compounds in the dyeing composition for conditioning the hair and would expect such a composition to have similar properties to those claimed, absent, unexpected results.

Conclusion

The remaining references listed on forms 1449 have been reviewed by the examiner and are considered to be cumulative to or less material than the prior art references relied upon in the rejection above.

Page 5

Application/Control Number: 09/832,877

Art Unit: 1751

Q.e.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Eisa B Elhilo whose telephone number is (703) 305-0217. The examiner can normally be reached on M - F (7:30-5:00) with alternate Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Yogendra Gupta can be reached on (703) 308-0661. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0661.

Eisa Elhilo
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 1751

October 20, 2003.